

Remarks

Rejections under 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 8, 9 and 11 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections. Claims 16-18 have been withdrawn and new claims 19-24 have been added.

With regards to the summary of the invention it is usual practice in many countries, including the USA, to include claim information in the summary to form a basis for the claims. Hence the applicants do not intend to amend this section of the application.

With regard to the title the applicants propose the following title:

"A Method and Application to Schedule and Connect Calls"

Regarding claim 9 this claim has been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejections. In addition page 11 line 22 to page 12 line 21 offers support for this claim.

Claims 8 and 11 have also been amended to overcome the 35 USC §112 rejections.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

Regarding the obviousness rejection the applicants respectfully believe these are unfounded for the following reasons:

In the present invention the user through a web based application enters details about a future call which includes: time of call; source and destination information; passwords; time zone information, etc. Then, at the specified time of call the application recognizes that a call is scheduled and automatically connects the user to another caller, a conference or whatever without any further input from the user. The call connection is made automatically via the communications network:

traditional, IP or a combination thereof. This is now more clearly defined in the amended independent claims and is thus distinguished from Newman (US 2003/0037109) and AAPA (applicant's admitted prior art).


Newman is a virtual room video conferencing system where there is system for scheduling video conferences via a number of different methods. These may include web based scheduling. However there is no teaching of subsequently connecting the scheduled calls at the allotted time. There is also no suggestion of there being any addition information, e.g. passwords, source and destination numbers included in a web based application readable form to facilitate this automatic connection and routing without further user input. Newman is merely an example of the prior art identified in the specification and thus the applicants believe the present claims are allowable over Newman. AAPA similarly does not teach any of the inventive features of the invention and cannot when combined with Newman achieve the results claimed.

Regarding the rejection of claim 9 (which is dependent on claim 1) as being obvious over Newman, AAPA and Grandgent (US 2003/0021400), since claim 1 is now believed to be allowable the Applicants respectfully suggest that since Grandgent does not teach any additional features to claim 1, claim 9 is also allowable over the combined prior art.

Further and favorable reconsideration are urged.

November 23, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26,935
Barnes & Thornburg LLP
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 214-4800
(312) 759-5646 (fax)